



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

CRIMINAL LAW—JURISDICTION OF OFFENSE—LOCALITY OF OFFENSE.—COMMONWEALTH *v.* BALL ET AL., 104 S. W. 325 (KY.).—*Held*, where deceased was shot in one state, and died in another state, the crime was committed in the state where the shooting occurred, and the courts of that state have jurisdiction.

Homicide is committed in the state where the felonious act occurs, although death takes place in another state. *U. S. v. Guiteau*, 10 Fed. 161; *State v. Garrison*, 147 Mo. 548. So, where a mortal blow is struck in a United States fort and death occurs in the state outside the fort, the state has no jurisdiction over the homicide. *State v. Kelly*, 76 Me. 331. But there is a contrary view, for homicide is only completed when death occurs. *U. S. v. Bladen*, Fed. Cas. No. 14,605; *Commonwealth v. Linton*, 2 Va. Cas. 205. And a statute giving the state authority to convict a citizen of another state or country for homicide, where the injured party died within the state, the injuries having been inflicted upon the high seas or in another state, is constitutional. *Commonwealth v. Macloon*, 101 Mass. 1. But a statute is also valid which declares that prosecution may be maintained in a state where the fatal blow has been struck, although death occurs elsewhere. *Green v. State*, 66 Ala. 40. And, where one stands in one state and shoots a person in another state, the murder is committed in the latter state and its courts alone have jurisdiction of the offense. *State v. Hall*, 114 N. C. 909.

DAMAGES—MEASURE—DESTRUCTION OF GROWING CROPS.—BERARD ET AL. *v.* ATCHISON & N. R. CO. ET AL., 113 N. W. 537 (NEB.).—*Held*, the measure of damages for the destruction of a growing crop is the value of the crop at the time of its destruction.

The measure of damages for the destruction of a growing crop is the value of the crop in the condition it was in at the time of the injury. *Colo. Con. L. & W. Co. v. Hartman*, 5 Colo. App. 150; *Richardson v. Northrup*, 66 Barb. (N. Y.) 85. For a growing crop has an approximate value, at every stage of its growth, and the measure of damages is the value of the crop at the time of its destruction with lawful interest from that time to the present. *Clarke v. Banks*, 6 Houst. (Del.) 584; *Ry. Co. v. Lyman*, 57 Ark. 512. And, in estimating the value of growing crops destroyed, it is proper to take into consideration the fact that the land was very fertile and productive, and that it had for a number of years produced better crops, and they had brought better prices than the average. *Economy Light & Power Co. v. Cutting*, 49 Ill. App. 422. But, in *Shotwell v. Dodge*, 8 Wash. 337, in an action for damages for the loss of a hop crop, the measure of damages is said to be the market value of the crop alleged to be lost, over the cost of producing, harvesting and marketing. And the measure of damages is the market value of the crop at the time of its injury, less the fitting of it for market, and diminished by whatever the value of the portion saved, if any, may be. *Smith v. C. C. & D. R. R. Co.*, 38 Ia. 518. But evidence of what the value of a crop would have been if it had matured is of too speculative a character to form a proper basis for damages. *I. & G. N. Ry. Co. v. Benitos*, 59 Tex. 326.

DIVORCE—REVIEW—EFFECT OF DEATH OF SUCCESSFUL PARTY.—CHATTERTON ET AL. *v.* CHATTERTON, 83 N. E. 161 (ILL.).—*Held*, that a husband against whom a decree of divorce was granted at the suit of the wife, may, after the